

RACHEL H. MITCHELL  
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

By: Thomas P. Liddy (019384)  
Joseph J. Branco (031474)  
Joseph E. LaRue (031348)  
Karen J. Hartman-Tellez (021121)  
Deputy County Attorneys  
MCAO Firm No. 0003200

CIVIL SERVICES DIVISION  
225 West Madison St.  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Telephone (602) 506-8541  
Facsimile (602) 506-8567  
[liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
[brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
[laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
[hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
[ca-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:ca-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov)

Emily Craiger (Bar No. 021728)  
[emily@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:emily@theburgesslawgroup.com)

THE BURGESS LAW GROUP  
3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
Telephone: (602) 806-2100

*Attorneys for the Defendant*  
*Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Kari Lake and Mark Finchem,  
  
Plaintiffs,

vs.

Kathleen Hobbs, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00677-JJT

**MARICOPA COUNTY DEFENDANTS’  
RESPONSE OPPOSING PLAINTIFFS’  
EXPEDITED REQUEST TO  
SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD [DOC.  
93]**

(Honorable John J. Tuchi)

1 Plaintiffs have filed a request to supplement the record with “a declaration from Ms.  
2 Busch together with exhibits consisting of the video footage, access logs, and other related  
3 data.” [Doc. 93, Plaintiffs’ Expedited Request to Supplement the Record.] The Maricopa  
4 County Defendants oppose Plaintiffs’ request.

5 First, this Court has already held the evidentiary hearing in this matter. New witness  
6 testimony is therefore improper.

7 Second, the Maricopa County Defendants should have the right to cross-examine Ms.  
8 Busch if her testimony is going to be considered by this Court. Because the hearing has  
9 already happened, there will be no opportunity for the Maricopa County Defendants to do  
10 so. Thus, the veracity of Ms. Busch’s declaration-statements will remain untested.

11 Notably, there is significant difference between the Notice of Supplemental Authority  
12 the Maricopa County Defendants filed jointly with the Secretary of State [Doc. 94], and  
13 Plaintiffs’ proposed filing. The Notice of Supplemental Authority alerted this Court to an  
14 official letter sent by the Arizona Attorney General to Senate President Fann, alerting her to  
15 his official findings concerning whether ballots were fraudulently cast in the names of  
16 deceased voters. That letter is an official government record, of which this Court can take  
17 judicial notice. Unlike Plaintiffs’ proposed declaration, it is not witness testimony, nor does  
18 it seek to offer exhibits after the evidentiary hearing.

19 For the foregoing reasons, the Maricopa County Defendants ask this Court to deny  
20 Plaintiffs’ Expedited Request to Supplement the Record.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1  
2 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 2nd day of August, 2022.

3 RACHEL H. MITCHELL  
4 MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

5 BY: /s/ Karen Hartman-Tellez  
6 Thomas P. Liddy  
7 Joseph J. Branco  
8 Joseph E. La Rue  
9 Karen Hartman-Tellez  
10 Deputy County Attorneys

11 THE BURGESS LAW GROUP  
12 Emily Craiger

13 *Attorneys for the Defendant*  
14 *Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 2, 2022 I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF registrants on record.

/s/ V. Sisneros